



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,560	01/04/2002	Eyal Dotan	8221-84872	7101
23493	7590	12/21/2005		
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 401 Castro Street, Ste 220 Mountain View, CA 94041-2007			EXAMINER HOFFMAN, BRANDON S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2136	
DATE MAILED: 12/21/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/037,560	Applicant(s) DOTAN, EYAL	
	Examiner Brandon S. Hoffman	Art Unit 2136	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-16,19,21,23,24 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-16,19,21,23,24 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11-21-05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6, 8-16, 19, 21, 23, 24, and 26 are pending in this action, claims 7 and 25 are canceled.

### *Rejections*

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code that are not included in this rejection can be found in a prior Office action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. Claims 1-6, 8-16, 19, 21, 23, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,839,850) in view of Hayman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,859,966).

Regarding claims 1 and 13, Campbell et al. teaches a process/computer-readable medium for protecting a computer from hostile code, the process comprising:

- Defining at least two trust groups, each of the defined trust groups being characterized by a trust group value (fig. 5a, gauges are the trust group and thresholds are the trust group values, higher thresholds would mean a higher trust group, see also col. 11, lines 20-59, discussion on gauges and how they are used in barriers and boundaries - boundaries relating to policies such as the use of FTP);

- Assigning objects and processes in the computer to one of said trust groups, irrespective of the rights of a user of said computer (fig. 5a, the objects and processes are the events and they are assigned to gauges);
- Defining an action rule for each combination of process trust group value, object trust group value, and object type (fig. 5b, see also col. 13, lines 12-24); and
- Upon an access request by a requesting process to a target object, performing the action indicated by the action rule applicable to the trust group value of the requesting process, the trust group value of the target object, and the object type (fig. 5b and 5c, see also col. 20, lines 1-26).

Campbell et al. does not teach defining at least two object types or assigning an object type to each of the objects.

Hayman et al. teaches defining at least two object types and assigning an object type to each of the objects (col. 2, lines 39-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine defining object types and assigning an object type to each object, as taught by Hayman et al., with the process/medium of Campbell et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because some objects are passive and others are executable; passive objects should be treated differently than executable objects. The teachings of Campbell et al. disclose combining objects and processes

Art Unit: 2136

with object types – it would be desirable to encompass objects that are both passive and executable.

Regarding claim 2, Campbell et al. as modified by Hayman et al. teaches wherein a process is assigned upon creation to the trust group assigned to the passive code from which the process is created (see col. 3, lines 19-31 of Hayman et al.).

Regarding claim 3, Campbell et al. as modified by Hayman et al. teaches further comprising changing the trust group of the process if the trust group value of the process is greater than the trust group value of the object (see col. 4, lines 38-51 of Hayman et al.).

Regarding claim 4, Campbell et al. as modified by Hayman et al. teaches further comprising changing the trust group of said object after performing said action (see col. 4, lines 38-51 of Hayman et al.).

Regarding claim 5, Campbell et al. as modified by Hayman et al. teaches further comprising, upon creation of an object by a process, assigning said created object to the trust group of said process (see col. 3, lines 19-31 of Hayman et al.).

Regarding claim 6, Campbell et al. as modified by Hayman et al. teaches further comprising defining at least two operation types and wherein said combination includes at least one of said operation types (see col. 2, lines 42-43 of Hayman et al.).

Regarding claim 8, Campbell et al. as modified by Hayman et al. teaches further comprising assigning said process to the trust group of said object if the trust group of said process is higher than the trust group of said object (see col. 5, lines 25-46 of Hayman et al.).

Regarding claim 9, Campbell et al. as modified by Hayman et al. teaches wherein upon a restart of said process, the trust group of said process reverts to the original trust group of the object from which the process was created (see col. 3, lines 24-28 of Hayman et al.).

Regarding claim 10, Campbell et al. as modified by Hayman et al. teaches further comprising:

- Defining at least two process types (see col. 2, lines 36-38 of Hayman et al.);
- Assigning processes to one of said process types (see col. 2, lines 36-38 of Hayman et al.); and
- Wherein said combination includes at least one of said process types (see fig. 5b and 5c, see also col. 20, lines 1-26 of Campbell et al.).

Regarding claims 11 and 16, Campbell et al. as modified by Hayman et al. teaches wherein said object types comprise passive code and executable code (see col. 2, lines 39-41 of Hayman et al.).

Regarding claims 12 and 15, Campbell et al. as modified by Hayman et al. teaches wherein said operation types comprise open, read, create, modify, and delete (see col. 2, lines 42-43 of Hayman et al.).

Regarding claim 14, Campbell et al. as modified by Hayman et al. teaches further comprising instructions causing the computer to:

- Define a table of types of at least two types of objects, the objects in the computer being assigned one type (see col. 2, lines 39-41 of Hayman et al.); and
- Wherein said plurality of rules defines said actions further based on the type of said object (see fig. 5b and 5c, see also col. 20, lines 1-26 of Campbell et al.).

Regarding claims 19 and 21, Campbell et al. as modified by Hayman et al. teaches wherein the computer is operatively coupled to a network, the network including a server, the table of trust groups/rules is stored in said server (see fig. 1, ref. num 100 and 106, and col. 12, lines 10-18 of Campbell et al.).

Regarding claim 23, Campbell et al. teaches a computer comprising:

- A random access memory (fig. 2, ref. num 206);

- A non-volatile memory (fig. 2, ref. num 208);
- A processor coupled to said RAM and said non-volatile memory (fig. 2, ref. num 104);
- Wherein said non-volatile memory comprises:
  - A list of rules, each rule defining an action based on an object type (fig. 5b, see also col. 13, lines 12-24);
  - A list of object trust groups, each trust group defining an object trust value and coupled to at least one of said rules (fig. 5a, gauges are the trust group and thresholds are the trust group values, higher thresholds would mean a higher trust group, see also col. 11, lines 20-59, discussion on gauges and how they are used in barriers and boundaries - boundaries relating to policies such as the use of FTP);
  - A plurality of objects, each of said objects having an object type and assigned to one of said trust groups (fig. 5a, the objects are the events and they are assigned to gauges)

Campbell et al. does not teach a list of object types or assigning objects to an object type and wherein when a process is created in said RAM from an originating object of one of said objects, said processor assigns to said process a process trust value equal to the object trust value of said originating object.



Hayman et al. teaches a list of object types and assigning objects to an object type (col. 2, lines 39-41) and wherein when a process is created in said RAM from an originating object of one of said objects, said processor assigns to said process a process trust value equal to the object trust value of said originating object (col. 3, lines 19-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine a list of object types and assigning objects to an object type and assigning a trust value equal to the object trust value of the originating object, as taught by Hayman et al., with the computer of Campbell et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because some objects are passive and others are executable; passive objects should be treated differently than executable objects. The teachings of Campbell et al. disclose combining objects and processes with object types – it would be desirable to encompass objects that are both passive and executable

Regarding claim 24, Campbell et al. as modified by Hayman et al. teaches further comprising a controller receiving operation requests from said process to be performed on a target object of one of said objects and, upon receiving said requests said controller access said list of object trust groups, list of rules, and list of object type to determine whether to allow the operation (see fig. 5b and 5c, see also col. 20, lines 1-26 of Campbell et al.).

Regarding claim 26, Campbell et al. as modified by Hayman et al. teaches wherein the controller allows the operation request but the process trust value is lower than the target object trust value, said processor resets the process trust value equal to that of the target object trust value (see col. 3, lines 24-28 of Hayman et al.).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon S. Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Brandon Hoffman*

BH

*AL*  
*Primary Examiner*  
*BU 2131*  
*12/19/05*